

REMARKS:

- 1) A few minor corrections have been made in the specification by the present amendment. Also, at page 7 lines 15 to 17, an additional description of a feature of the originally disclosed invention has been added. Particularly, as can be clearly seen in Fig. 4 of the drawings, the inward extending portions (25a) of the seating surface supporting side bars (25) are not connected to each other and do not extend all the way across the width direction between the side bars (25). Instead, the inward extending portions (25a) are spaced apart from one another in the width direction when the baby carriage is in its unfolded or opened state as shown in Fig. 4. These features of the invention are clearly evident from original drawing Fig. 4, as well as the context of the specification at page 4 lines 6 to 11 and page 7 lines 15 to 27. Amending the specification to describe this originally disclosed feature does not introduce any new matter. Entry and consideration of the specification amendments are respectfully requested.
  
- 2) Prior claims 1 to 10 have been canceled. New claims 11 to 19 have been introduced. The new claims are based on the prior claims, but have been editorially and stylistically revised, because the original claims were essentially a literal translation of corresponding foreign claims that had not been drafted in view of typical US claim style. Furthermore, independent claim 11 has been revised to more specifically define the inventive subject matter. Claim 11 is supported by the

subject matter of original claims 1 and 2, original Figs. 4, 5 and 9 to 11, and the original specification at page 4 lines 6 to 11, page 7 lines 4 to 27, and page 8 line 19 to page 9 line 10. New claims 12 to 19 are supported by original claims 3 to 10 respectively in succession. Therefore, the new claims do not introduce any new matter. Entry and consideration of the new claims 11 to 19 are respectfully requested.

- 3) Referring to sections 1 and 2 on page 2 of the Office Action, the informalities noted by the Examiner in original claims 5 and 6 have been avoided in new claims 14 and 15. Please withdraw the claim objection.
- 4) Referring to section 3 on pages 2 to 3 of the Office Action, the rejection of claims 1, 3 and 6 as anticipated by US Patent 6,533,311 (Kaneko et al.) is respectfully traversed.

New independent claim 11 incorporates the features of prior claims 1 and 2. Claim 2 had not been rejected as anticipated by Kaneko et al. Particularly, Kaneko et al. do not disclose an arrangement in which an inward extending portion extends from a rear portion of a seating surface supporting side bar. Instead, the alleged inward extending portion (24, 24a) extends inward adjacent to the front legs. Already for this reason, the anticipation rejection cannot be applied against present independent claim 11.

Furthermore, present independent claim 11 recites that the rigid inward extending portions respectively terminate laterally inwardly at unsupported free distal ends that are not connected

to each other. Furthermore, the inward extending portions do not extend all the way across the width direction between the supporting side bars, i.e. the rigid inward extending portions have a lateral space therebetween in the width direction when the baby carriage is in its opened state. This feature is also contrary to Kaneko et al. Namely, the only inwardly extending portions are the connecting rods (24) with hinges (24a), which are connected to each other so that the connecting bars extend entirely across the width direction between the side bars. Particularly, the crosswise connecting bars (24) do NOT have inward unsupported free distal ends, and do NOT have a lateral space therebetween in the width direction.

For these reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the anticipation rejection based on Kaneko et al.

- 5) Referring to section 4 on pages 3 to 4 of the Office Action, the rejection of claims 2 and 4 as obvious over Kaneko et al. in view of US Patent 5,820,144 (Wang) is respectfully traversed.

New independent claim 11 has been discussed above in comparison to Kaneko et al. As acknowledged by the Examiner, Kaneko et al. do not disclose inward extending portions that extend from a rear portion of the side bars. Moreover, Kaneko et al. do not disclose and would not have suggested inward extending portions that terminate laterally inwardly at unsupported free distal ends that are not connected to each other, but instead have a lateral space between the inward extending portions in the width direction.

The Examiner has further referred to Wang for disclosing a rear rod member (24) that allegedly forms inward extending portions that extend inwardly from a rear portion of the side bars (28). However, the rear rod member (24) is a continuous one-piece rod (24) which extends entirely across the width of the baby carriage between the linking plates (17) and also between the side plate members (28) (see col. 3 lines 43 to 61). Thus, even when the rear location and the further features of the rod member (24) according to Wang would have been considered in combination with Kaneko et al., there still would have been **NO** suggestion to provide inward extending portions as presently claimed. Namely, even the combined teachings of the references would NOT have suggested that the inward extending portions must terminate laterally inwardly at unsupported free distal ends that are not connected to each other. Also, the combined prior art would NOT have suggested that the inward extending portions must have a lateral space therebetween in the width direction.

The express teachings of the references are directly contrary to the above mentioned features of present claim 11. Furthermore, the teachings of Wang regarding the rear rod member (24) would not even have been suitable in connection with Kaneko et al., or in the context of the presently claimed baby carriage, because present claim 11 requires that the baby carriage must be foldable so as to be reduced in dimension in a width direction. The above mentioned features of claim 11 relate to this widthwise foldability, which is neither provided nor suggested by the continuous one-piece rod of Wang.

For the above reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the obviousness rejection applying Kaneko et al. in view of Wang.

6) Referring to section 5 on pages 4 to 5 of the Office Action, the rejection of claims 1 to 6 as obvious over US Patent 5,181,735 (Onishi) in view of Kaneko et al. and US Patent 6,964,429 (Suga et al.) is respectfully traversed.

Significant features of present independent claim 11 have been discussed above in comparison to Kaneko et al. Even a consideration of Onishi in view of Kaneko et al. and Suga et al. would not have suggested the above discussed inventive features.

The Examiner has acknowledged that Onishi fails to teach rigid inward extending portions as presently claimed. Moreover, even if an element such as the side bar coupling member (22) would have been compared to the present inward extending portions of the seating surface supporting side bars, it would be evident that this coupling member (22) does NOT represent inward extending portions that terminate laterally inwardly at unsupported free distal ends that are not connected to each other. Also, there is NO lateral space in the width direction between the inward extending portions. Instead, the coupling member (22) extends all the way across the width of the baby carriage between the side bars. That teaches directly away from the contrary requirements of present claim 11.

The Examiner has further cited Suga et al. for disclosing a connecting member that is turnably connected to an inverting member and a seating surface supporting side bar. Nonetheless,

the disclosure of Suga et al. would have provided no further suggestions toward the above discussed features of present independent claim 11, relating to the rigid inward extending portions of the supporting side bars. To the contrary, the seat stay or connecting bar (124) that supports the seating surface from beneath extends continuously and entirely between the side bars (123), and thus teaches directly away from the above discussed requirements of claim 11 relating to the inward extending portions terminating laterally inwardly at unsupported free distal ends, with a space therebetween.

All of the references are thus directly contrary to this feature of the invention. Thus, even a combined consideration of Suga et al. and Kaneko et al. as discussed above, with the teachings of Onishi, would not have suggested the present invention defined in claim 11.

For the above reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the obviousness rejection applying Onishi in view of Kaneko et al. and Suga et al.

- 7) Referring to section 6 on pages 5 to 6 of the Office Action, the rejection of claims 7 to 10 as obvious over Kaneko et al. in view of US Patent 5,201,535 (Kato et al.) is respectfully traversed. New independent claim 11 has been discussed above in comparison to Kaneko et al. Kato et al. do not disclose or suggest any additional features that would have motivated a modification of Kaneko et al. toward achieving the present invention. Particularly, Kato et al. also fail to suggest inward extending portions of the side bars having the features as discussed above.

Kato et al. also would not have suggested such features, because the stroller of Kato et al. is not foldable to reduce the width dimension thereof. Thus, even a combination of the two references would not have made present independent claim 11 obvious. The dependent claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art already due to their dependence. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the obviousness rejection applying Kaneko et al. in view of Kato et al.

- 8) Referring to section 7 on page 6 of the Office Action, the rejection of claims 7 to 10 as obvious over Onishi, Kaneko et al. and Suga et al. further in view of Kato et al. is respectfully traversed. Present new independent claim 11 has been discussed above in comparison to the disclosures of all of these applied references. Since none of the references provide any suggestions toward the features of claim 11 discussed above (relating to the inward extending portions of the side bars), even a combination of all of the references would have provided no such suggestions. The dependent claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art already due to their dependence from claim 11. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the obviousness rejection applying Onishi, Kaneko et al. and Suga et al. further in view of Kato et al.
- 9) The additional prior art made of record requires no particular comments, because it has not been applied against the claims.

10) Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application, including all present claims 11 to 19, are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kenzou KASSAI et al.  
Applicant

WFF:ks/4629  
Enclosures:  
Transmittal Cover Sheet

By Walter F. Fasse  
Walter F. Fasse  
Patent Attorney  
Reg. No.: 36132  
Tel. 207-862-4671  
Fax. 207-862-4681  
P. O. Box 726  
Hampden, ME 04444-0726

CERTIFICATE OF FAX TRANSMISSION:

I hereby certify that this correspondence with all indicated enclosures is being transmitted by telefax to (571) 273-8300 on the date indicated below, and is addressed to: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450.

Walter F. Fasse 4/11/06  
Name: Walter F. Fasse - Date: April 11, 2006